



Remarks

Regarding patent application number 10/820,268 filed 04/08/2004, the argument for pointing out disagreements with the examiner's contentions in the USPTO communication date mailed 04/14/2008 is as follows.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goff et al. (6,417,894) and regarding the rejection of claim 1, the Goff et al. optical device for adjustably magnifying the visual display on the screen of a computer or television is positioned between the person viewing the screen and the screen, and said optical device is in front of the computer or television screen. The optical device in the present application is located within the television and at and between the location of the originating television signal going to the television and the television. Regarding the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goff et al. (6,417,894) and regarding the rejection of claims 2, 3 and 4, claims 2, 3 and 4 are dependent claims regarding claim 1 which is no longer anticipated by Goff et al. Regarding claim 2, the variation in vision prescription in the present application is associated with the optical device located within the television and at and between the location of the originating television signal going to the television and the television as opposed to that of Goff et al. Regarding claim 3 and 4, the magnifier in the present application is associated with the optical device located within the television and at and between the location of the originating television signal going to the television and the television as opposed to that of Goff et al. Regarding the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goff et al. (6,417,894) and regarding the rejection of claims 5-9, the Goff et al. device does not deliver or provide eye-glass prescriptive signals to a television screen prior to the television picture or image appearing or displayed on the television screen through broadcast television signal manipulation as does the present application. The Goff et al. device allows the viewing of television images or pictures from on and in front of the television screen after the television picture or image appears on or is displayed on the television screen.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Blum (4,929,865), the Blum patent describes (per your communication) "an eye comforting device for optically adjusting the focal distance for screen viewing of a video display". Regarding the Blum patent, the viewer views the display from 'in front' of the display as the image or picture is displayed onto the display. The optical device in the present application is located within the television as opposed to the Blum patent. The

optical device in the present application is located between the location of the originating television signal going to the television and the television as opposed to the Blum patent which is located between the viewer and the television display.

The present application is associated with the optical component of the television signal and image or picture becoming positioned on the display, screen or viewing surface as opposed to the Blum patent which is associated with the viewing of an image or picture on a display or after it is positioned for display or viewing.

Considering the present application, the variation of the optical signal occurs within the television or at or between the originating broadcasted television signal and the television as opposed to the Blum patent in which the variation a) occurs after the picture or image is displayed (or maybe even) as the picture or image is displayed and b) the variation of the optical signal occurs per the device which is located near the viewer and 'in front' of the display.

The information above pointing out disagreements with the examiner's contentions are reflected in the Corrected Amendments to Claims submitted with my response to your 04/14/2008 communication and is included with my present communication. The claims have been adjusted a) to reflect "the optical device in the present application located within the television and at and between the location of the originating television signal going to the television and the television" and b) to reflect the above disagreements with the examiner's contentions and hence distinguishes the claims of the present application from the references. The present communication also discusses the references applied against the claims and explains how the claims avoid the references or distinguishes them from the references.

